

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Examiner Watko is thanked for thoroughly reviewing the subject patent application. All claims are now believed to be in condition for allowance, and allowance is so requested.

The invention describes a magnetic write head that is not subject to severe excess saturation that can lead to adjacent track erasures. This is accomplished by dividing the bottom pole into front and rear sections with a step between them. The write gap is part of the front section while the rear section (to which the front section is attached) is closer to the top pole so excess flux generated by higher write currents can be absorbed in a direction normal to the ABS instead of being diverted to the bottom pole shoulder.

Reconsideration is requested of all rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103, as being unpatentable over Ohtomo et al. (US PAP No. 20040105189):

A careful re-reading of examiner's well-written rejection of all claims has confirmed our view that the flux extender disclosed by the present invention is novel and not present in the cited prior art. However, examiner's implied position that Ohtomo also describes a flux extender is understood, even though Ohtomo does not describe this part of his structure in those terms.

It is important to note that, wherever Ohtomo shows an element that bears a resemblance to our flux extender, it does not have all the structural characteristics of the flux extender disclosed by the present invention. In particular, Ohtomo's flux extender, as embodied by element 22 in his figs. 12 and 13, is not shaped, relative to the top pole above it, in such a way as to optimize the diversion of excess flux away from the general area surrounding the write gap.

As can be seen in our FIGs. 5 and 9, flux extender 53 has the same shape and size as the top pole so that it neither overlaps nor under-laps it (except at the end farthest from the ABS). The significance of this shape matching (and alignment) is as follows:

- (1) where the top pole overlaps the flux extender, less than the optimum amount of flux will be diverted;
- (2) where the flux extender overlaps the top pole, more than the optimum amount of flux will be diverted.

We have therefore amended claims 1, 8, 15, and 22 to include this additional limitation to the shape and position of the flux extender. The relevant section (which is the same in all the amended claims) is as follows:

connected to said flux concentrator on said rectangular prism upper surface, a flux extender whose upper surface is coplanar with said flux concentrator upper surface, and that extends therefrom for a distance;

said flux extender being shaped so that it does not overlap said top pole and said top pole does not overlap said flux extender except where said top pole extends beyond said rectangular prism upper surface;

All claims are now believed to be in condition for allowance, and allowance is so requested.

It is requested that should there be any problems with this amendment, to please call the undersigned Attorney at (845) 452-5863,

Respectfully submitted,

Saile Ackerman LLC
28 Davis Avenue
Poughkeepsie
NY 12603
By 

Stephen B. Ackerman
Reg. No. 37761